HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 32 Saturday, August 6, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

What Price Geneva: The outstanding discovery of the week in Washington was that the Capital is behind the country in caution about the "peace-from-now-on-is-certain" sentiment generated by the recent Geneva conference. When the Reds released the 11 fliers, observers expected signs of gratitude towards Peiping among the people and an inclination to appease the Red China Government. On the contrary, leaders of both parties on Capitol Hill — including even the left-wing Senator Humphrey — strongly hedged their satisfaction. They showed that they desired no appeasement to the Reds in return for the latters' belated action in doing what they should have done long ago. These congressional leaders, it is a matter of common knowledge, are well aware that their constituents feel the same way.

Indeed, those in the Capital who "went overboard" on immoderate hopes for peace as a result of the "cordiality" at Geneva have received abundant mail of the variety of "how naive can you be?" from out in the country, and ever since have been busy "explaining."

Significant of the wind of caution is the reaction of even so strong a New Deal columnist as Marquis Childs, now in London on a journalistic tour. Childs (August 1) found the European relaxation "disquieting" after Geneva where the Communists yielded "so very little — hardly more than signs of good will." Additionally, other American journalists abroad appear concerned about the announced policy of "secrecy" for the talks now going on in Geneva between U.S. and Red Chinese Ambassadors. Secret diplomacy and another Yalta deal — these are obviously feared.

Senator McCarthy's speech criticizing not only the President but also Congress and the press for accepting the view that Russia is "sincere" in working for peace, brought no real answers to his probing questions on the floor. The debate, however, did draw laughter at one point:

Senator George Bender sought to defend the President and somewhat ludicrously called on McCarthy to "amend his ways" and "join the rest of us in our fight with Communism." This apparently was too much for both galleries and the floor, which burst into laughter. The Wisconsin Senator joined in the merriment, making a gesture of holding his sides.

But not a few members of the GOP side reacted with unhappiness to the Wisconsin Senator's repeated promise that he would "day after day" take his case to the public. They fear that McCarthy will concentrate his speaking in a half dozen big-city, big-electoral vote states, where certain "minority groups" can wield the balance of power.

For cloakroom gossip relates that previous to Geneva, leaders of Polish-American groups visited Washington and sought an interview with the President. White House aides brushed them off. As one veteran commented: "Roosevelt would have seen them. He would have lied to them, of course. But he would never have brushed them off."

Congress Goes Home: In appraising the work of the last congressional session three distinct viewpoints have to be considered:

(1) From the standpoint of conservatives who want the present enormous powers of the Executive curtailed and desire less government in business, the session was simply a steady expansion of basic objectives of the New Deal. Spokesmen for this viewpoint point with genuine alarm to (a) continuation of civilian foreign aid (supposed to have been wound up last year) in what is regarded as the launching of a Marshall Plan for Asia; (b) a further expansion of social security coverage; (c) authorization for a severe cut-back of the tariff menacing many small businesses; (d) continuation of public housing;

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(e) a military reserve bill which, it is claimed, gives UMT a solid foot in the door; (f) lag in national air power; (g) failure of Congress or the Administration to show any serious intentions of balancing the budget.

(2) From the standpoint of New Dealers, Democrats and Republicans alike, Congress failed lamentably to go far enough. They are discontented that there was no bill for Federal aid to education passed; also that Congress did not go for a multi-billion dollar highway measure. They are sharp in their criticism that the public housing bill passed provided for "only" 45,000 units. And they are chagrined that the colossal Colorado River project, which would have put the government into another TVA and distributed the taxpayers' money on reclaiming arid land at a fantastic cost, bogged down in the House Rules Committee after passing the Senate. In general the leftists are hot under the collar that Congress did not go down the New Deal trail at a much faster clip.

(3) From the standpoint of some Administration supporters, the results were better than they could have been. They claim that, with a Democratic Congress on his hands, the President did minimize the damage. They point out that, although Eisenhower initially championed Federal aid for school construction, he backed away from the measure when the facts revealed the exaggerated claims about the financial inability of the States to take care of their school requirements, and did not lift a hand to pressure Congress. Similarly on the highway bill the Administration skillfully maintained a hands-off attitude leaving Congress free to make its own decision. Although the Administration did support the Colorado River project, it likewise refrained from any interference on Capitol Hill favoring its passage. Then having made a fairly creditable record, the President, after adjournment, weakened. He hinted he might call a special session, his purpose obviously being to make appeasement of the Left on these issues.

Talbott: The resignation of the Secretary of the Air, under fire for using his office to help his business, will provide much ammunition in the expected Democratic assaults on the Eisenhower Administration. Insiders here believe that Talbott only resigned after he learned that the White House would fire him if he did not do so.

Actually, observers here believe the wrong lesson is currently drawn from the Talbott affair — that the defect of businessmen in government is their continuing links with private business. These observers believe that such examples as Talbott are rare; that the businessman in government as a rule suffers from quite a different disability. They believe, from numerous instances, that the average businessman enters government from very high motives, or at least, only from vanity, i.e., the desire to enjoy the prestige of high office. As such, they claim, he is an "innocent," unaware of the realities of dealing with the bureaucracy. The real danger lies in a too frequent occurrence, namely, that a businessman executive, through ignorance, is surrounded and shaped by the New Deal holdovers in the Executive arm of the government. That is an old story dating from World War II days, and the Korean War period — and many instances were noted. The failure of the Eisenhower Administration to thoroughly purge the bureaucracy of the "holdovers" and to replace them with conservative Republican officials is an outstanding fact in the Capital today. As is well known, the preceding Democratic Administration blanketed into civil service many thousands of purely political appointees.

This situation may prove very costly to the Eisenhower Administration next year as the campaign for political power opens. One guess among observers here is that the Democratic investigating committees on Capitol Hill plan a big concerted assault on Eisenhower executive officials and that the ammunition will be supplied by Democratic New Deal holdovers who know where the files are that contain damaging information.

The Fed Moves: Top news. In hopes of stopping the dangerous growth of credit inflation, the Federal Reserve Board has approved what are considered moderate boosts in the rediscount rate of district Federal Reserve Banks.

Intent: to discourage inflation without being depressive. Result: certainly much anxious private discussion about effects. "Remember the recessive consequences of the last boost in '53," is one reaction. If the boom continues to swell, a second boost may follow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholic Theologian on "Right-To-Work" Laws: The Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C. SS. R., Dean of the School of Sacred Theology, Catholic University, Washington, D. C., holds that "right-to-work" laws do not violate Catholic principles. He differs with several Catholic spokesmen, including the Bishops of Ohio, Archbishop Ritter of St. Louis and Archbishop Rummel of New Orleans, who denounce such laws as anti-union.

Father Connell declared: "It is true, the Catholic Church upholds the principle (of natural law) that legislation that would unduly restrict the right of workers to form unions and to act through these organizations for their reasonable welfare or that would injure social and economic progress would be immoral.

"Those who believe that the laws in question would produce such evils have a perfect right to expound and defend their views and to oppose such legislation. But I cannot see how they can propose their views as the teachings of the Catholic Church. They can propose them *as their own conclusions from a principle taught by the Catholic Church.* On the other hand, if other Catholics believe that the "right-to-work" laws do not produce evil results but rather help to adjust industrial and economic conditions, they are fully free to uphold such legislation, *as their own view,* without denying or opposing any Catholic principle.

"I myself am not sufficiently familiar with all the industrial conditions to entitle me to favor definitely either side; but I do contend that what is involved is an application of principles, not principles themselves. As we all know, two intelligent and sincere persons can agree on a principle, and yet come to opposite conclusions in applying it to a concrete issue.

"There is no Catholic principle to the effect that every worker is bound to join his union.

"If in particular circumstances, the union needed the cooperation of all the workers in a particular field, there would be an obligation on all individual working men to join it."

Father Connell said that a Catholic could work for an organization favoring "right-to-work" laws if he felt the organization was sincerely trying to improve labor-management conditions, but if he were aware that the organization was simply trying to destroy unions, he could not cooperate with it in good conscience.

Father Connell made this further comment: "We must be careful in our use of the argument that if a man gets the benefit of a union, he must join the union. I believe there is a flaw in this statement.

"It should be said, rather, that if a man benefits by a union, he is bound to return some benefit to his fellow workers — but not necessarily by joining the union. He might do his share toward benefiting them by setting a high example of a conscientious, diligent worker, or by visiting his fellow workers in their sickness, or by working as a St. Vincent de Paul member for their benefit."

Father Connell said, "The argument that all workers have a duty to join their union is similar to that used by anti-Catholics who demand that we pay taxes on our schools and church property; if you get tax benefits, you should pay for them." Father Connell said that the Catholic answer is, "We do pay for them, by providing things of spiritual value to the public.

"I believe a similar response might be made by the man who does not join a union," he said.

Space Satellite: A storm of protest from Capitol Hill arose on July 30 after the announcement by the White House — unveiling the plans for a U.S. space satellite experiment — that information gained from the project would be shared with all nations, including Russia. Senator Bridges (R., N.H.) called for a re-examination of the decision to share such data with Soviet Russia, expressing fear that such information "might eventually be used against our own security." He was joined by Senator Russell (D., Ga.), chairman of the Armed Services committee, who expressed "grave doubts" about the White House proposal: "I'm just not in favor of sharing anything with the Russians until we have a better understanding with them." Also, Senator Byrd (D., Va.) said that "it (the release of data) could be used for war-like purposes." Another prominent Democrat, Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington, opposed "any exchange of information in this program" because "the first consideration will be the military application."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Red Dope: Here and there, in back pages of the eastern Metropolitan press, emerges a picture of the appallingly immoral power with which we are dealing at the Geneva "talks."

Washington date-line, July 20, Associated Press reports Chairman Eastland, Democrat of Mississippi, as saying that testimony received by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee shows how Red China has used narcotics as a weapon in efforts to dominate other Far Eastern nations. "It (Red China) has established a huge business in the illegal sale of drugs in Japan, Indonesia, Malaya, Ceylon and other free nations." And he added, "Competent witnesses have told us that the many millions of dollars the Communists have obtained from this despicable enterprise are being used to subvert officials of neighboring governments, to infiltrate the labor organizations, to demoralize the youth of military age."

The next day, from New York, A.P. July 31, a group of prominent Americans said that Communist China is "inadmissible" to the United Nations because it promotes the international drug traffic. The group is the Committee of One Million, whose policy is to oppose the admission of Communist China to the UN. It bases this latest report on testimony by Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, who says that the million-dollar profits from the narcotics trade are used by the Chinese Communists to carry on subversion throughout Southern Asia. The Committee leaders include Senator Paul Douglas, Representative Francis Walter, Senator H. Alexander Smith, former Ambassador Joseph C. Grew, former Governor Charles Edison and former Secretary of State General George C. Marshall.

"Those forces," say the group, "both in our own country and abroad, who favor appeasement of Red China in return for vague promises, may consider the discussions at Geneva a major triumph for their point of view."

Social Security: House extension of social security coverage, which died in the Senate, sought to lower the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 (although women, statistics show, live on the average five years longer than men); to jack up the contributions from employers and employees to 4½%; to give benefits to disabled persons at the age of fifty and "to impose on self-employed persons heretofore not covered," as Representative Wint Smith (Rep., Kan.) put it, "involuntary tax slavery."

The Kansas Representative pointed out that while all this would cost $2.5 billions, yet *no hearings* were held by Congressional Committees and *only 40 minutes of debate* in the House was allowed.

Representative Noah Mason remarks that under the present social security system its tax burden by 1975 will amount to *twenty billion dollars.* Mason offers a picture of the plight of a farmer in 1975 (assuming that the present heavy load of Federal taxes does not increase). If such a farmer, he says, earns $4200 in that year and has a wife and two children, his Federal income tax will be $276. But his social security tax will be $283.50. Thus the social security system is destined — in the not far distant future — to impose on taxpayers a *burden greater than the present one imposed by the Federal income tax.*

Mason brands the social security system as an unsound plan "to tax our children and grandchildren when the time comes to meet the obligations that the present generation has supposedly paid for and are entitled to receive when they reach retirement age — a Ponzi-type shell game that is bound to collapse when the load becomes too heavy to carry."

Letter from The Honorable JOHN W. BRICKER, United States Senator from Ohio: "HUMAN EVENTS is on my 'must' reading list. I have found its reports and interpretations on the Washington scene to be accurate and thought-provoking."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER
HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. **Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 32 HUMAN EVENTS August 6, 1955

Article Section

IT'S AN ANGRY TIME IN DIXIE

The South Has No Candidate to Call Its Own

By JAMES J. KILPATRICK

THE QUESTION that dwells largest in the troubled mind of the South these days is the future of its public education. As this is written, the question is wholly unresolved; the immovable object and the irresistible force have yet to meet head-on. Over much of the South, a resolute determination to preserve segregation is growing stronger; the orders of the Supreme Court to put an end to it remain untested. Together, black gum and thunder await the coming storm.

But around the edges of this brewing hurricane, other little whirlwinds are growing, and these are not without interest elsewhere in the land. What of next year's presidential election? Where will Dixie take its stand?

There was a time, of course, and the time lasted a long time, when the question would have been idle: the South would go Democratic. It was as certain as death, as certain as taxes. And if the white-pillared mansion of the Solid South showed a chip now and then — if its masters sang a little flat on the Sidewalks of New York — the massive facade of our faithfulness remained unimpaired.

This venerable structure cracked badly in 1948: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and one unreconstructed elector from Tennessee, Mr. Preston Parks of Somerville, may his name endure, cast their lot with J. Strom Thurmond, candidate for the presidency on the States Rights Democratic ticket. Some other verandahs sagged in 1952: Florida, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia went shamelessly Republican. The Democratic mansion will crack again in 1956. The mood of many a former Democrat is to pull the temple down. He ain' gonna need this house no longer.

How will the pillars fall? Four factors, possibly a fifth, will affect the upheaval. The four that plainly will play a part are (1) the course of public education; (2) the Negro vote; (3) the course of the Democratic National Convention; and (4) the records and promises of the major party candidates. The fifth factor, now an outside possibility and no more, is the rise of a third party with strong appeal to Southern conservatives.

But if these factors can be defined, and neatly tabulated, their most probable operation scarcely can be predicted at all. The South, as a participant in national politics, is in turmoil. For 10 years, or roughly since the disillusion with Mr.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Truman set in, party labels have been meaningless for large numbers of Southern voters. We have followed that resolute inconsistency of the Midwesterners who will vote dry as long they can stagger to the polls. The staunchest Republicans in the nation, if the proper noun may be used in the pre-Eisenhower sense, dwell in Southside Virginia and the coastal counties of South Carolina and Georgia; and they are Democrats, suh, they are Democrats to the last man. In their participation in national politics, they are sadly reminded of that curious croquet game in *Alice,* where flamingoes served as mallets and the balls were made of hedgehogs: our party has uncurled itself and crawled away.

In the election of 1952, this confusion resolved itself in wholesale defections from the Democratic ticket. The electoral vote tells only part of the story. In Alabama, where no Republican since Hoover had claimed as many as 45,000 votes, 149,000 went with the GOP. In Arkansas, the normal Republican vote tripled; in Georgia it soared from a puny 77,000 to nearly 200,000. In North Carolina, Stevenson won by only 94,000 votes out of 1,200,000 cast; in Kentucky it was closer still — a margin of 700 votes in more than 1,000,000. Mississippians, calling themselves "independents," revolted by the thousands. In South Carolina, two slates of electors carried the Eisenhower name; Democratic honor survived by a shaky 5,000 votes.

Now, the great bulk of this outpouring was no manifestation of sentiment *for* the Republican party as a political institution; if a substantial part of it was affirmatively for Mr. Eisenhower, the individual, the overwhelmingly greater part of it was an expression *against* the National Democratic party. Yet the Republicans, as a party, could have capitalized upon this nascent rebellion, nourished it, made it their own. They have failed to do so. This was their great chance in the South. They flubbed it.

All that is by way of background. It is to say that if certain plainly visible trends had continued uninterrupted — if the National Democratic party between elections had kept veering to the left and the Republican party had given the South no offense — the South predictably would have carried its disaffection to greater lengths in 1956.

BUT THEN CAME the Spring of 1954; then came the Great Decision of May 17. With that decision, the South's new picture of the Republican party changed. Out faded the Cheshire grin of Mr. Eisenhower; in its place appeared the urbane countenance of Mr. Brownell, addressing the high court, *amicus curiae,* at the President's request. From that day since, we have thought of "Republicans," and thought first of the pleasant, Rotarian face of Mr. Warren. We have heard his avuncular voice reading a decision that made rubble of established law and ripped the South's society to shreds.

The impact of this decision, considered from a wholly political point of view, plainly has hurt the Republican party's prospects in the South. This may not be fair — after all, the unanimous nine included seven Democrats, among them three Southerners — but the damage is there nonetheless. It is "Warren's decision" and popularly it was delivered "on the instructions of Brownell;" and if the image of Mr. Brownell giving orders, say to Mr. Justice Frankfurter arouses an incredulous snort,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I can only report the public opinion reaching my own newspaper in 3,500 letters a year.

So far, little of this resentment — and it is bitter resentment — seems to have rubbed off on Mr. Eisenhower. The rain falls on the high court, not on the fifth tee. Public opinion polls show little drop in the President's personal popularity. Yet the impression I receive from a number of leading "Democrats for Eisenhower" is that their enthusiasm ebbs — not because of the court decree, but because the President's demure Republicanism is not quite the "change" they had hoped for.

Over the next 12 or 15 months, as the courts' crackdown comes — or fails to come — the political consequences of the Supreme Court decision will begin to jell. If this should cause widespread abandonment of public education, Southern opinion, seeking a target on which to vent its honest outrage, almost certainly will fall upon the Republican party it so recently embraced.

If politics in the South made sense, it would be anticipated that the events that have alienated conservative white persons in the South would have won wholehearted support from the Negro. Alas, here politics make no sense. The Negro vote in the South is as devotedly Democratic in its label as the conservative vote is Republican in its convictions. Under Mr. Eisenhower, the Republican Administration has brought the Southern Negro everything but a seat in the Cabinet. Yet the still, small voice of gratitude is still and small. Negro leaders reason that the party of Mr. Truman has done nothing to warrant their deserting it; the National Democratic party remains, in their eyes, their friendly party of FEPC and poll tax repeal and public housing. How important is this Negro vote? It is of growing importance, and in some closely-contested localities, almost of pivotal importance. Numerically small, it is felt as a bloc; it votes as a bloc. In the scramble ahead, it plays a significant part in political calculations below the Potomac.

THE THIRD FACTOR is brewed from the bitter tea of Chicago, 1952. That the notorious "loyalty oath" of the convention floor was a feeble pledge at best, not nearly so demanding as the loyalty oaths imposed upon Democratic officeholders at the State level, has been lost sight of wholly. This hot tempered Donnybrook three years ago is remembered only as the crowning indignity of an indignant hour. Here was the *South,* bastion of the national party, preserver of its fortunes through the dark night from Harding to Hoover, guardian of Democratic traditions, home of Jefferson — here was the *South,* mind you, about to be evicted from its own home. Here was a passle of slick Yankees — Humphrey, Williams, and their ilk —undertaking to lecture the *South* on loyalty to the Democratic party! The South resented it, heaven knows; and heaven knows, the South's party loyalty, as events proved, was scarcely bottled in bond.

Three years have done nothing toward healing this wounded pride. Indeed, there was speculation recently that if the Republicans only could keep Stephen Mitchell on the road, that engaging missionary of ill will, the Republicans might yet capture Dixie. If the convention attempts again in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1956 to discipline Southern delegates, or to coerce them toward blind support of a ticket that is anathema to them, this honest outrage will fall upon the Democratic party. We are full of outrage down here. It is an angry time.

The melancholy foreboding that afflicts many Southern conservatives is that neither party will produce a ticket worth their support. They foresee a Democratic convention dominated by hot-eyed Reuthers from Detroit and zealous Powells from Manhattan; the handwriting on the wall spells out a platform more "liberal" than the one they rejected in 1952; they see Southern delegates to the convention, not as members of the party, but as outsiders, unwanted and unloved.

BUT IF THE nightmare features pink donkeys, it offers pink elephants too. If Eisenhower should not run, then who would? And if Eisenhower does run, what then? You like the "change?" You want more?

At the moment, this prospective choice of evils is all the South can see. The third party movement that pulled in 1,000,000 votes for Thurmond in 1948 has lost its motivating force; the States Rights Democrats were born of opposition to Mr. Truman, as the Whigs of 1834 were born of hatred for Jackson. Byrnes is no Calhoun; New England has no Webster; Kentucky offers not a Henry Clay — it offers an Alben Barkley. The South's only conservative leadership votes Republican but runs Democrat, and the ancient label of the Democrat still commands patronage, seniority and the dutiful respect that goes with age and habit.

In the end, the conservative South may throw away its vote in 1956. We may go fishing on Tuesday. But if a solid conservative third party should emerge, offering a ticket the Southerner could respect, such a ticket might well win most of the Deep South's 109 electoral votes. In such an event, the Southerner fondly dreams, both a pink Democrat and a pastel Republican might fall short of the 266 electoral votes required for election nationally. If the final election could be thrown in the House of Representatives, where each State casts a single vote, the South's voice at last might be heard in the land.

This remote hope is thin broth for a robust region, but it is about all the political nourishment the conservative South can find right now.

JAMES J. KILPATRICK is Editor of the *Richmond (Va.) News-Leader*. He previously contributed to HUMAN EVENTS on March 19, "This Was the House of Our Fathers: The Implications of Federal Housing," and on May 14, "Not to Be Solved on a Slide Rule: A Southernor Looks at the Problem of Integrated Schools."

Additional copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30.
In quantites of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. **Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED